

REMARKS

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl et al U.S. Patent 6,333,720 in view of Powell U.S. Patent 6,243,050. Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl et al as modified by Powell, in further view of Le et al U.S. Application 2005/0001778. Claims 21 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl et al as modified by Powell, and further in view of Wood et al U.S. Patent 6,211,840. Claims 26-29 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl et al in view of Powell.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 4-20, 22 and 25 are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has considered Gottl '720 in view of Powell '050, and respectfully sets forth the following distinctions. The Examiner correctly notes that Gottl '720 is directed to a dual-band antenna, and that Gottl does not teach that the dipole elements are adapted to provide a first and second beam each having a 90-degree azimuth beamwidth. Applicant also notes that Powell discloses a single band vertically polarized antenna that may have up to a 90 degree azimuth beamwidth.

However, a substitution of two vertically polarized antennas shown by Powell for each of the dipole elements shown in Gottl will not result in a dual-band antenna creating two beams each having a 90-degree azimuth beamwidth. Rather, an antenna having two beams each having about a 45 degree azimuth would result due to isolation problems, cross coupling, just to name a few technical issues. The present invention, as claimed, achieves technical advantages over the cited prior art by providing such a dual-band antenna wherein each beam has a 90-degree azimuth beamwidth. The present invention solves a long felt need by providing such a dual-band antenna.

It is notable that for all the prior art directed to dual-band antennas, and single-band antennas having a 90 degree azimuth, such as Powell, there is no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of a dual-band 90-degree azimuth beamwidth antenna because achieving such an antenna was very difficult to realize. Gottl '720 is a fair representation of the prior art, realizing a dual-band antenna with each beam having a 65 degree azimuth beamwidth.

It is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art, including the combination of Gottl in view of Powell, for the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of independent Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With regards to Claims 2-3, it is noted that the present application is now a continuation-in-part of the noted commonly assigned U.S. Patent Application to Le et al. Hence, this rejection is believed to be overcome as well.

The remaining claims all ultimately depend from allowable independent Claim 1, and thus are believed to be in condition of allowance as well.

Application notes that this Response has been filed within two (2) months of the date of Final Rejection, and a favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any other matters which remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve these matters by Examiner's amendment where possible.

No additional fees are believed due, however, should any other fees be due the Examiner is authorized to debit the deposit account 50-1752.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert C. Klinger', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert C. Klinger
Reg. No. 34,365
Attorney for Applicant

Jackson Walker L.L.P.
2435 North Central Expressway, Suite 600
Richardson, Texas 75080
(972) 744-2902
(972) 238-3302 – Fax